REFLECTIONS,

HISTORICAL and POLITICAL,

OCCASION'D BY

A TREATISE Lately publiſh'd,

ENTITLED,

A VINDICATION of General MONK and Sir RICHARD GRANVILLE, &c.

To which are added,

A REPLY to that Part of it, which relates to Biſhop BURNET's Hiſtory of his own Times:

AND

NEW PROOFS of the MISREPRESENTATION and PARTIALITY in the Earl of *CLARENDON*'s and Mr. *ECHARD*'s Hiſtories.

Extracted out of the ſaid VINDICATION, and *RAPIN*'s Hiſtory of ENGLAND.

By John Oldmixon

See p. 32

LONDON:

Printed for A. MILLAR, at *Buchanan*'s-Head, over-againſt St. *Clement*'s Church in the *Strand*. M.DCC.XXXII.

(Price One Shilling.)

Br 2027.32.7660 F

HARVARD COLLEGE
JAN. 2 1918
LIBRARY

Gift of
William Endicott, Jr.

REFLECTIONS, Hiſtorical and Political.

AS I have always read every thing that has been written by the noble *Vindicator*, with a great deal of pleaſure; ſo I could not fail of having an Impatience to read the *Vindication* of General *Monk* and Sir *Richard Granville*, which is written with the ſame Genius and Eloquence, as are all the Works of that excellent Author.

But there have occur'd to me in reading it ſeveral Things, which I am under a ſort of neceſſity to communicate to the Publick, not only becauſe they confirm what I have advanced in other *Treatiſes*, of the Infirmities in the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, and Archdeacon *Echard*'s Hiſtory; but will alſo ſet Readers right in their Opinion of Biſhop *Burnet*'s *Hiſtory of his own Times*, and other Matters touched upon in the *Vindication*, which I have had opportunities to be well informed of. The Endeavours that have been lately uſed to depreciate that Hiſtory, are not likely to anſwer the End deſign'd by it. There have too much Paſſion and Pique appeared in it: And beſides, it would be equally vain and extravagant to imagine, that a *Critique* upon it, in a Paper that is to live but from one Week to another, would deſtroy a large Folio Hiſtory, that, in all probability, will live as long as our Language.

I am as ſenſible as that Author, or any other can be, that there are ſome things in the Biſhop's Hiſtory liable to exception; and one in particular that I heartily wiſh out of it. But let me acquaint him, and all of his Sentiments, that if they had deferr'd publiſhing their Quarrel with the Biſhop, till the ſecond Volume of his Hiſtory was publiſhed, and they had read the Great Character of King *William* at the Cloſe of his Life, they would have confeſt, that his Lordſhip had done juſtice to his *Glorious Memory*; and there-

fore could have no Reſentment to miſ-lead him, as they pretend. Nay, we need not ſtay for the Publication of that Volume to know his Lordſhip's Sentiments of the Royal Virtues of that Prince; for in his *Dedication* of his Expoſition of the thirty-nine Articles to King *William*, having ſpoken of the want of Reformation of Manners, he adds, *The effectual purſuing of theſe Deſigns, as it is the greateſt of all thoſe Glories of which Mortals are capable, ſo it ſeems to be the only thing that is now wanting to finiſh the brighteſt and perfecteſt Character that will be in Hiſtory*, Which is very conſiſtent with but *one Vice*, and probably human Infirmity never admitted of higher Perfection.

There is in the Biſhop's Hiſtory ſo great variety of the moſt curious Facts and Characters, that it will, like other ſuch Memoirs, be always entertaining. I grant there is much *Hearſay* in it, and how could it be otherwiſe? Many of the Incidents were never committed to Writing, till the Biſhop preſerved them in his Hiſtory. Look over all Antiquity, ſhew us what Hiſtorians, who wrote of their own Times, produced better Proof. All Hiſtory muſt be taken from *Hearſay*, which is not pilfer'd from other Hiſtories, or publick Memorials. What better Proof have we than the Word of the Author in *Thucydides*, *Polybius*, *Saluſt*, *Suetonius*, in any of the *Roman* Hiſtorians, and much leſs of the *Greek*. To ſay the *Greeks* and *Romans* were honeſter than we, has perhaps too much Truth in it. But it muſt be ſaid too, that the Writers are at leaſt as honeſt as the Readers; and why ſhould they not truſt one another, as well in Hiſtory, as in Traffick, the Credit of which they have certainly much more at Heart, and yet take one another's Word upon all occaſions?

It is impoſſible for an Hiſtorian to write well of his own Times, without telling what he has been told. Is not *Thuanus* himſelf full of *Hearſay*? and has not that very advantage of his, rendred his Work the delight of the Curious of all Nations, notwithſtanding it was carp'd at by the Friends to Tyranny and Bigotry, and even by ſome learned Men of ſounder Principles, probably to ſhew the Delicacy of their Taſte and Judgment? *Voſſius* did not ſtick to ſay, there were in it *multa Falſiſſima & Indigna*, much Falſhood and Scandal. Yet, who would not rather be Author of one Page in *Thuanus*, than of the two great Hiſtories the noble *Vindicator* ſo juſtly animadverts upon, in *Vindication* of General *Monk* and Sir *Richard Granville*? To ſay all at once, that Dr. *Burnet's* is the *Hiſtory of the Scandal of his own Times*, wants a little more Explanation than we meet with in that elegant Treatiſe. It ſhould be conſidered, that he treated of Men and Things, which,

according

according to the general Idea of good *Britons*, were equally wicked and hurtful. As of *Penſioners* in a *pack'd* Parliament, as Monſ. *de Rapin* calls it; Of the *Addreſſes* for Arbitrary Power and Perſecution; Of the Betrayers of the Charters of Cities and Corporations; Of the League made at *Dover* between King *Charles* II. and *Lewis* the XIVth, to ſuppreſs the Parliament of *England*, and introduce Popery; In ſhort, of King *Charles*'s giving up almoſt his whole time to *debauch'd Miniſters and Miſtreſſes, Perſons of profligate Lives*; All which, and a great deal more of the like Nature, is told us by *Rapin*, as well as by the Biſhop; and, how could the Hiſtory of his own Times be written without telling it, and how could it be told without Scandal? Could the Characters of ſuch Men as *Lauderdale, Danby, Jefferies*, &c. be tranſmitted to Poſterity pure and immaculate? *Vol. 11. p. 393.*

It is ſaid farther in the *Vindication*, *What a jumble is here of wild incoherent Slander, with as little Judgment as Truth?* *Vol. 8. p. 92.*

Monſ. *Rapin* ſeems to have a very great Idea of both the Biſhop's Veracity and Judgment, where he ſays, the *Biſhop of* Saliſbury *was an exact Hiſtorian, if ever there was one.*

Again, *What a Heap of Contrarieties are here for the ſake only of a ſatirical Concluſion upon the King*, Charles II. *falſe and ſcandalous? The Sale of* Dunkirk *being in the ſecond Year of his Majeſty's Reſtoration, when he was newly married, long before the Influence of any Miſtreſs.* *Vindication.*

I believe I may venture to ſay, every one knows King *Charles* the Second took Mrs. *Palmer* from her Husband almoſt as ſoon as he came to *Whitehall*. The noble *Vindicator* ſeems to allow it himſelf. *The King had ſtarted other Game upon the very Day, and had ſecured ſomething to embrace, which he liked much better than a Wife of his own.* *Vindication.* Every one knows Mrs. *Palmer* had, from the firſt to the laſt, as much Influence over him as ſhe pleas'd, till her other Gallantries loſt her his favour. Does not the Character of that King juſtify whatever may be ſaid of the Influences of his Miſtreſſes over him? His being a married Man, did not in the leaſt change his Conduct as to his Amours. *A. Wood* in his *Athen. Oxon.* ſpeaking of the *Portugal* Match, mentions this very Influence of the Miſtreſs over the Monarch. *A Year after the King's Return*, ſays *A. Wood*, *King* Charles *ſent* George Digby *Earl of* Briſtol *to negotiate a Match for him with the Princeſs of* Parma, *and had almoſt brought it to perfection, but* Edward *Earl of* Clarendon *broke the Earl of* Briſtol's *Meaſures, by contriving the Match with* Katherine, *the Infanta of* Portugal: *whereupon the* *Vol. 2. p. 579.*

Earl

Earl being thus fool'd, proved a bitter Enemy to the Lord Clarendon, *and engag'd* Barbara Palmer, *afterwards Dutcheſs of* Cleaveland, *to be his Enemy alſo.* And that the Money given King *Charles* by the Parliament, ſoon after his Reſtoration, was all ſquander'd as faſt as it came in, is obſerved by *Rapin.*

Farther, *By this one flagrant Inſtance of Prejudice,* which we muſt remember the Biſhop had from the Chancellor's own Son, *in every Circumſtance meer* Invention, *and* fabulous, What is reported from *Hearſay,* is not properly Invention; and if it be fabulous, the Reporter is firſt accountable for it, *The World may judge of the reſt of thoſe uncharitable Reflections, and manifold Defamations, ſo confidently ſpread throughout the whole Book, and daringly dedicated to the God of Truth.*

Monſ. *de Rapin Thoyras,* who, by the way, was the firſt who took notice of the diſagreement between Biſhop *Burnet*'s and Archdeacon *Echard*'s Hiſtories, and *D'Eſtrade*'s Letters, with reſpect to Chancellor *Hyde*'s negotiating the Sale of *Dunkirk,* which is the inſtance above cenſur'd, ſpeaks very tenderly of the Biſhop's and the Archdeacon's Miſtake. I make uſe of the *Tranſlation.*

" It muſt, however, be ſaid, in Excuſe of Mr. *Echard* and Biſhop " *Burnet,* that when they wrote that Part of their Hiſtory, the Count " *D'Eſtrade*'s Letters, which gave an Account of his Negotiation, " were not yet publiſh'd; and that thoſe Hiſtorians knew no more " of this Affair, than what they had receiv'd from the Earl of *Cla-* " *rendon*'s Friends." Which is very different from what is ſaid in the *Vindication, The Biſhop could not plead Ignorance.* D'Eſtrade's *Letters were in every Man's Hands ſeveral Years before the Publication of his Book.* But *D'Eſtrade*'s Letters, according to *Rapin,* were not publiſh'd, when Biſhop *Burnet* wrote his Hiſtory; and he adds, that *Hiſtorian* could know no more of the Matter, than what he had from the Lord *Clarendon*'s Friends. It is therefore very unwillingly that we repeat after the Vindication,

To conclude, we may very well ſay, what becomes of all thoſe other Ill-natur'd Invectives, thoſe unchriſtian Reflections, thoſe Defamatory Characters, and all that Dirt, *ſcatter'd up and down, in which neither Rank, nor Dignity, nor Sex is ſpared!*

The noble Author knows, as well as any Man, that whatever an Hiſtorian ſays of one Party in a Country, where there is more than one, will be cry'd out againſt by another, as *Dirt,* as *Falſe and Scandalous*; tho' like Stinks and Perfumes they have their Denominations from the Taſte of the Perſons that meet with them: and as

what

what is Stink to one Man, is Perfume to another; ſo what is Scandal to one Party, is good Hiſtory to another.

That Paſſage in the *Vindication* which relates to one in the Hiſtory, where the Biſhop of *Salisbury* ſays, *He had it from Mr.* Henley, *who had it from the Dutcheſs of* Portſmouth, *that King* Charles II. *was poiſon'd*; gives me more concern than any other which touches that Prelate, becauſe it has lain in my way to have that ſaying of hers confirmed, by what ſhe ſaid to others; and I have been credibly inform'd, ſince the *Vindication* was publiſh'd, that the Biſhop not only told the Story often, as from Mr. *Henley*, while he was alive, but that this Lord *Sunderland*'s Father told it to the late King, and his Grandfather made it no Secret that he had it originally from the Dutcheſs her ſelf: for the Truth of which, I dare appeal to that noble Family, and to thoſe who convers'd with his Lordſhip's Father and Grandfather. The Fact is notorious, and will not be conteſted by any one, that had ever ſo little Acquaintance with thoſe noble Perſons. What Opinion then muſt we have of that Dutcheſs's fair Dealing in what follows, taken out of the *Vindication!*

" It was my Fortune to be reſiding at *Paris* when this Hiſtory " was publiſh'd; ſuch a Particular was too remarkable not to raiſe " my Curioſity. The Dutcheſs was then likewiſe at *Paris*; I em- " ploy'd a Perſon who had the Honour to be intimate with her " Grace, to enquire from her own Mouth into the Truth of this " Paſſage: Her reply was this, that ſhe recollected no Acquaintance " with Mr. *Henley*; but ſhe remember'd well Dr. *Burnet* and his " Character, That the King, and the Duke, and the whole Court, " look'd upon him as the GREATEST LYAR *upon the Face* " *of the Earth*, and there was no believing one Word that he " ſaid."

The noble Vindicator is ſo far from approving this ſhocking Scandal, and moſt uncourtly Language, that he bears his Teſtimony againſt it.

I only repeat the Anſwer I receiv'd: far be it from me to make any ſuch Reflection.

There is ſomething ſo inhumane in the Dutcheſs's calling the Biſhop a LYAR, That one cannot account for it, but by conſidering ſhe was a *French* Woman, a *Papiſt*, and——What ſhe deſerves to be called in the full of the Mouth; but I do not like her Example ſo well, as to imitate it. Beſides, it will be obſerved, that this *French* and Popiſh Dutcheſs, *&c.* avoids anſwering the Queſtion, whether ſhe did really tell Mr. *Henley* that King *Charles* II. was poiſoned? and only ſays, ſhe did not recollect any Acquaintance with him.

'Tis

'Tis poſſible her Memory at that Age might fail her, as to Acquaintance with him. He was a Lad when ſhe firſt left *England*; and at her Return ſhe ſtaid not long enough to form or ſettle Acquaintance with Mr. *Henley*, or any one elſe of his Principles; but having told others as well as him, that King *Charles* II. was poiſoned, ſhe does not touch upon that. It is ſhuffled off with a want of Recollection, and a Slander on the Biſhop of *Salisbury*.

If there was a Man in *England* whom *the King, and the Duke, and the whole Court* hated more than any Mortal elſe in the World, it was this Dr. *Burnet*, who had been hang'd if they could have caught him: and their Hatred to him being for his Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion, the Dutcheſs thought herſelf at liberty to give what Name ſhe pleaſed to the profeſs'd Enemy of her Church. The pious Catholicks could never forgive his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, and ever ſince it was publiſh'd, have been labouring with all their Malice and Might to ruin his Credit, that the Credit of the *Reformation* might fall with it; and the Abettors of Popery have not been wanting in their Endeavours to obtain that wicked End. Thus it comes, that ſome others of better Principles have given into their Slander, and ſpoken unworthily of the Biſhop, not only for the Hiſtory of his own Times, but for his Hiſtory of the *Reformation*. The former is intirely in favour of Liberty, and the true *Reformed Religion*, and no doubt that has procur'd it many a bad Word from Perſons in other Intereſts. Whatever Faults it may have, and what human Work is exempt from them? can neither be attributed to an Intention to deceive, nor an Eaſineſs of being deceiv'd. What he has ſaid both of himſelf, and his beſt Friends, will free him from the Imputation of Partiality; as his Account of the *Popiſh Plot* and Lord *Eſſex*'s Death will, from that of giving Credit too readily to the Appearances of Things, where his Enemies were concern'd. The few Errors that have hitherto been detected, and thoſe of ſo little Importance, notwithſtanding all the Zeal and Induſtry that have been us'd to decry this Hiſtory, may convince us that the Biſhop has been more accurate than uſual in it, and much more than was to be expected from him in a Work of this Nature. If we reflect upon the uncommon Quickneſs with which he was known to compoſe all his Writings, we ſhall be ſurpriz'd to find the Miſtakes ſo ſmall, and ſo few. The Simplicity which runs thro the whole Work ſhews, as we have elſewhere obſerved, that he never intended to impoſe on his Readers. He believed what he wrote to be true; and doubtleſs it is ſo in as great a degree as any other Hiſtory whatſoever: and we ought in common

common Charity ſo to believe it, till it is prov'd otherwiſe, and that not by offering Hearſay againſt Hearſay, but by credible and authentick Evidence.

As I had the Honour to be known to his Lordſhip, and to have had much diſcourſe with him on the Subject of his Hiſtory, it will not be a diſagreeable Digreſſion to add a few Words. A very great Lord and Miniſter, for whom the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and all good *Britons*, had a particular Affection and Eſteem, having read the Hiſtory in Manuſcript, met with his own Character; and we ſhall all meet with it, when the ſecond Volume comes out; Upon which, the next time he ſaw the Biſhop, he thank'd him very heartily for the favour of reading the Manuſcript, adding, that though he was wonderfully pleaſed with it, he could not but confeſs he thought his Lordſhip had, in one place, ſaid too much Good and too much Ill of a Perſon. Biſhop *Burnet* asked, *who it was?* The Lord reply'd, *myſelf; you have ſaid a great many good things of me, more than I deſerve; and, I think, ſome bad too, as that I am too reſerved and proud.* To which the Biſhop replied, *My Lord, 'tis the Unhappineſs of your Lordſhip, and other great Men, to know every thing, and every body, better than yourſelves.*

The Biſhop ſaid, *as he believed, his Hiſtory would gain more Credit with Poſterity, than his Works in his Life-time, through Party and Prejudice, had done; that he made the ſame Conſcience of affirming any thing there, but upon grounds which he thought ſolid, that he would do of affirming a Falſhood on his Death-Bed; for he looked upon it as a Legacy, which he hoped Poſterity might be the better for.* He review'd his whole Work with the utmoſt Care, and corrected many Paſſages, ſtruck out others, and inſerted many very material ones in the Year 1711, when the late Earl *Stanhope* was with him at *Salisbury*; ſo very ſollicitous to the laſt was the reverend and learned Hiſtorian to make his Work as uſeful, as pleaſant, and as perfect as poſſible, from his own Knowledge, and the beſt Information from Perſons the beſt acquainted both with Men and Things. For all which, beſides his conſummate Knowledge in divine and human Learning, he was farther qualified by his incredible Application and Strength of Mind; an unparallel'd Inſtance of which was his undertaking the laborious Task of a *third* Volume, by way of Supplement to his two former, of the *Reformation*, when he was ſeventy Years old, and he finiſh'd it within the Compaſs of little more than two Years, ſeldom working at it leſs than ſeven Hours a day; yet during this Labour, and all his other the like Labours, he never abated one tittle in the

Duties of his Function; of which, both Court, City, and Country were Witneſſes. To return to my Subject——

Monſ. *Rapin* has directed us right in making a Judgment of his Lordſhip's Hiſtory, which having been attack'd in the Article relating to one *Grant*, a *Papiſt*, Director of the *New-River* Company at the time of the Fire of *London*, that judicious Hiſtorian undertakes its Defence in this manner:

"This is the Account given by Dr. *Burnet*, and agrees, in the "main, with that of Mr. *Echard*, nevertheleſs an anonymous Au- "thor accuſes him of Falſhood, and aſſerts, that *Grant* was not re- "ceived amongſt the *Directors* till after the *Fire*."

Dr. *Lloyd*, afterwards Biſhop of *Worceſter*, told Biſhop *Burnet*, that *Grant* got into the Directorſhip, purely to have it in his power to hinder the Uſe of that River Water for extinguiſhing the Fire.

And this anonymous Objector aſſerts roundly, he was not admitted as a *Director* till after the *Fire*; upon which *Rapin* obſerves, "It "is not eaſy to decide what regard is due to the Teſtimony of this "anonymous Writer; whereas one cannot avoid giving Credit to "that of this ILLUSTRIOUS PRELATE, when he ſays he had it "from Dr. *Lloyd*, that *Grant* was one of the Directors before the "*Fire*."

I cannot part with the Paſſages in the *Vindication* concerning Biſhop *Burnet*'s Hiſtory, without taking ſome notice of a Suggeſtion which ſeems to come ſhort of the noble Author's candid and generous Sentiments in other Caſes.

No body but Monſieur Schomberg, *a Foreigner by Birth, and by way of Excellence, I ſuppoſe, a* Calviniſt, *in Religion appeared to have the Intereſt of* England *at Heart*.

Might there not have been a ſofter Turn given to this Expreſſion, than that the Biſhop mention'd Monſieur *Schomberg*'s Calviniſm by way of Excellence? Is not this Reflection more natural, that the Biſhop call'd him a *Calviniſt*, to ſhew it was on account of the Proteſtant Religion, that Monſieur *Schomberg* was deſirous *England*, the Bulwark of that Religion, ſhould continue poſſeſs'd of *Dunkirk*, which was her ſtrongeſt Bulwark againſt *France*, its moſt powerful and inveterate Enemy? He certainly could not ſo call him, as preferring *Presbytery* to *Epiſcopacy*, himſelf being a *Biſhop*.

I muſt away with whatever is ſaid in the *Vindication* in favour of General *Monk*, becauſe the noble Vindicator ſays it of a Relation, and it would be highly indecent to conteſt it. But if it could be done without giving Offence, I have ſufficient Memoirs to con-

firm what Biſhop *Burnet* writes of that General; of whom Monſ. *Bourdeaux*, the *French* Ambaſſador, ſaid: *He was no accompliſh'd Courtier nor Stateſman*, as in *Whitlocke* and Mr. *Locke*. That *he was a Man of no quick Parts*, which agrees more with what the Biſhop wrote of him, as *uſeleſs and inconſiderable* after the Reſtoration, than with what is written of him in the *Vindication*, where he is ſtiled the Father of his Country. I could enlarge on this Subject, was it not an invidious and ungrateful one; and I could therein make it appear, that the Biſhop of *Salisbury* has ſaid nothing ſo ill of General *Monk*, but other Authors have ſaid worſe; though we read in the *Vindication*, *That Prelate takes all occaſions to beſpatter the* General's *Character: His Crime was the reſtoring the King without Conditions or Limitations*. Good God! What a World of Miſeries was this poor Nation involv'd in, by his ſo reſtoring him? It makes one tremble to look back on the Dangers we were ſo many Years in, for want of thoſe Limitations and Conditions! Again,

The Royal Family, according to the Presbyterian *Scheme, was to be brought back in Chains, or not at all.*

The *Delaration of Rights*, before King *William* of Glorious Memory was made King, the *Act of Settlement* upon the Succeſſion of the Royal Houſe of *Hanover*, are full of Conditions and Limitations; but none of the Princes who have reign'd ſince, have look'd upon them as *Chains*, or taken it kindly to have them treated as ſuch in Compliment to Arbitrary Power.

There are many Reaſons why one would not rob General *Monk* of the Honour of the Reſtoration, the Felicities of which were, however, never enjoy'd till after the *Revolution*. But that very Honour has been diſputed by others; and if what Mr. *Locke* tells us is true, the Earl of *Shaftesbury* put in the beſt Claim to it; and General *Monk* was ſo far from intending to reſtore the King, that he reſolved to ſet up himſelf, as is at large related in Archdeacon *Echard*'s Hiſtory. Nay, the Archdeacon aſſures us, he had no ſuch Intentions after he came to *London* from *Scotland*. For, ſays he, IF the *Parliament had cultivated his tame Reſignation with any Temper and Diſcretion, by preparing his Approbation to their Proceedings, they might have found a full Compliance.*

It muſt be farther obſerv'd, that the Reſtoring the King without Conditions and Limitations, was not owing to General *Monk*, but to the *Council of State*, who were all *Presbyterians*.

The Queſtion was put in the Council, *whether they ſhould call in the King upon Treaty, or entirely confide in him?* and it was

reſolv'd to truſt him abſolutely. Mr. *Anneſley*, a *Presbyterian* and *Covenanter*, afterwards Earl of *Angleſey*, *ſo perſuading*, according to Archdeacon *Echard*.

Mr. *Locke* adds, *The Army ceas'd to be at* Monk's *Devotion, and this was that which gave the great Turn to the Reſtoring of the King, of which Sir* Anthony Aſhley Cooper *had laid the Plan in his Head a long time before.* The Objection to this is, *It is not from Flattery we are to ſeek Truth.* Mr. *Locke* had the advantage of a long and intimate Friendſhip with the Earl of *Shaftsbury*; but, I believe, few will charge him, who was the greateſt Philoſopher of his Age, with an Intention to flatter, or with collecting and hoarding up Minutes for that purpoſe, to be publiſh'd twenty or thirty Years after the Perſon ſo flatter'd was in his Grave, and after he himſelf was dead, and could receive neither Benefit nor Applauſe by ſuch Flattery.

Let me, on this Occaſion remember, that the *Council of State*, upon Sir *Anthony*'s Information of General *Monk*'s Negotiation with *Bourdeaux*, the *French* Ambaſſador, to aſſume the Government himſelf, oblig'd him on the Spot to take away the Commiſſions of ſeveral Officers, his Creatures, into whoſe Poſts they put their own Friends; and among others, particular mention is made of their giving the Government of *Dunkirk* to Colonel *Edward Harley*, which is ſtill Part of Mr. *Locke*'s Account of this matter, and is very different from what we read in the *Vindication*. "General *Monk* foreſaw early "what might happen to be the Fate of *Dunkirk*, and took his Pre-"cautions in the very beginning to prevent it, by placing Sir *Edward* "*Harley* in the Command." Whereas, according to Mr. *Locke*, Col. *Edward Harley* was plac'd in that Command by the *Council*, at the ſame time that they took away the Commands of the Officers who were *Monk*'s Creatures.

We muſt agree with the *Vindication*, where General *Monk* is defended againſt a Charge in *Echard*'s Hiſtory, of having concluded the Match with the Infanta of *Portugal*, not only becauſe it was prepoſterous and ridiculous to treat of a Marriage before the King had a Houſe to keep his Wedding in, but becauſe the *Portugal* Treaty was in truth in the Hands of the *Council of State*, and not in General *Monk*'s, as *Whitlocke* informs us, and that the Treaty was ſigned by them in the *Council-Chamber* at the ſame time that it was there ſign'd by the *Portugal* Ambaſſador.

'Tis ſaid in the *Vindication*, *It is reaſonable to think the* General *might go on with the Plan of an Alliance with* Portugal. But

it

it is much more reaſonable to think, that Mr. *Holles*, Mr. *Annesley*, Sir *Anthony Aſhley Cooper*, Mr. *Crew*, Sir *John Holland*, Sir *Harbottle Grimſton*, Mr. *Trevor*, Serjeant *Maynard*, and near thirty more ſuch great and wiſe Men, Members of the *Council* of *State*, who were *Stateſmen*, and Men of *quick Parts*, might go on with that Plan, and not General *Monk*, of whoſe Politicks and Integrity, it ſeems, they had no good Opinion.

Juſtly has the noble Vindicator obſerv'd the ſtaring Contradiction in Archdeacon *Echard*'s Hiſtory, where he ſays, *Chancellor* Hyde *was not privy to the* Portugal *Match*; and adds afterwards, he came chearfully into it, and we muſt acquieſce entirely in this Interrogation: *With what Face can any Man* ſay, *the Marriage was begun without his Privity, and concluded without his Approbation?* But ſuch Contradictions are ſo common in Mr. *Echard*'s Hiſtory, that they are hardly worth taking notice of.

Whether General *Monk* was or was not the Negotiator of the *Portugal* Match, one cannot well blame Biſhop *Burnet* and Archdeacon *Echard* for producing the Authority of Sir *Robert Southwel* in the Affirmative. The very Relation of it by the noble *Vindicator* inclines one a little to except this Marriage-Treaty, when his negotiating of Treaties is objected againſt; for the Archdeacon aſſures us, he had it out of a Manuſcript of Sir *Robert Southwel*'s, and the Biſhop, that Sir *Robert* told him ſo. Here is *Hearſay* confirm'd by a *Manuſcript*, and what ſtronger Foundation can an Hiſtorian build upon?

The Errors the noble Vindicator remarks in Mr. *Echard*'s Hiſtory, are, methinks, too notorious to admit of ſuch a fine Encomium upon it, as we read in the *Vindication*; eſpecially this, if the Hiſtorian has *been ſometimes deceiv'd*, it was by *too implicite a Faith in his Guides; he certainly had no Intention of being himſelf a Deceiver.*

This reflects as much upon his Judgment, as it approves his Honeſty. If he believed the Story of *Oliver's ſelling his Soul to the Devil at* Worceſter; he was fit to compoſe Legends, but by no means qualified for Hiſtory-writing: If he did not believe it, he was a Deceiver. But truly I can think no other, but that he did believe it; for he was ſo fond of that childiſh contemptible Tale, that he would not leave it out of a new Impreſſion, though he was preſt to do it. He is handſomely rebuk'd for it in the *Vindication*.

This pretended Conference overheard behind the Hangings, may be placed with Oliver Cromwell's *Converſation with the Devil before the Battel of* Worceſter.

What

What is farther ſaid in Praiſe of the ſame Hiſtory, however thus diſprais'd here and in other Parts of the *Vindication*, is the more ſurpriſing, for that it comes out at a time when that Hiſtory is no more ſpoken of, or in a manner, which is not at all Panegyrical. The Hiſtorian is now blamed univerſally for not only creeping ſervilely after the Lord *Clarendon* in his Characters, but making an aukward Imitation of them in his own, at the Expence ſometimes of Truth and Decency. However, upon one occaſion, he in an unuſual Manner ſoften'd his Term for the *Parliamentarians*, and inſtead of *Rebels*, call'd them *Delinquents*; at which the noble *Vindicator* takes offence in the following Paragraph.

" Theſe *Delinquents* were Perſons in actual *Rebellion* againſt " the King; why, then, not call them Rebels? Where was the Crime " of making the ſame uſe of the *Rebels* Eſtates, as the Rebels did " of the Royaliſts?"

It was not at all ſtrange, that the People who had been ſo well bang'd by the *Parliamentarians* ſhould, while the Blows ſmarted, call them *Round-heads*, and *Rebels*. 'Tis what we meet with every day in common Life. The Perſon that's beaten, is generally ſtout enough with his Tongue, when his Hands are of no uſe to him; but we are ſurpris'd, when we ſee Men of great Parts and Politeneſs ſo far to forget themſelves, as to prefer the Language of the Vulgar to their own. *Dugdale*, *Nalſon*, *Heath*, &c. were no Courtiers, and *Rebels* were as ſoft a Term as any in their *Lexicon*. The Earl of *Clarendon* wrote under the Reſentment of twelve years Baniſhment and Indigence, by which his Stile, as well as his Sentiments, could not but be much imbitter'd, and *Rebels*, *Rebellion*, and *Grand Rebellion*, might have been expected from him. But thoſe Terms, as apply'd to the Parliament, from the Year 1641 to the Year 1647, are ſcandalous and unjuſtifiable, as ſhall be prov'd by the Lord *Clarendon* himſelf. *If the King*, ſays his Lordſhip, p. 541. *ſhould commit ſuch an Outrage, as to levy War againſt his Parliament, to deſtroy the Religion, Laws, and Liberties of the Kingdom, Good Men were perſuaded ſuch a* Reſiſtance *might be made as might preſerve the whole. He that would have argued againſt this Theſis,* RESISTANCE, *would never have eſcap'd the Cenſure of promoting Tyranny and Lawleſs Dominion.*

If the ſuppoſition of *Tyranny* and *Lawleſs Dominion* was reduc'd to certainty, as we ſhall find he himſelf proves it was, then the *Reſiſtance* of the Parliament was no *Rebellion*, and the Proof of its being certain, is in the very next Page. *The Crown extended its Authority and Power beyond its Bounds, to the Prejudice of*

the

the juſt Rights of the Subject. I think the Argument is as Logical as may be: To extend Power beyond *its Bounds*, is to extend it beyond the Law, and conſequently ſuch Dominion is *Lawleſs*; and to *invade the juſt Rights of the People*, is Tyranny. By which Logick his Lordſhip makes the Promoters of the then Arbitrary Government, even the *Royaliſts* themſelves, to be guilty of no leſs a *Crime* than *Treaſon*: If there may poſſibly be *Treaſon* againſt the *Conſtitution*, as well as againſt the *Crown*. Whoever is curious to know by whom the *Civil War* was begun; whether by the King or by the Parliament, may be aſſur'd it was not by the Parliament in reading of *Whitlocke*, p. 52. and *Rapin*, Vol. xi. p. 361. where he writes, *The King's Deſign was to withdraw to* York, Feb. 11. 164$\frac{1}{2}$, *and levy Troops in thoſe Parts, in order to ſieze* Hull, *with the Magazine there; ſo that it is very likely from that time he had thoughts of War.* Again, *It is therefore very probable, that from this time,* the Queen's going to *Holland, the King had thoughts of War; but his Attempt upon* Hull, *where was a Magazine of Arms for* 18000 *Men, was ſtill a plainer Proof.* The Parliament iſſued Orders for levying Forces about *July* 10. 1642.

The noble *Vindicator* inſiſting upon it, that the *Parliamentarians* muſt not be ſo call'd, but *Rebels*; I am oblig'd to clear this Matter ſtill farther, to fix the *Miſnomer*, as well in this Caſe, as in the Title of the *Grand Rebellion.*

General *Monk* having reſtored the ſecluded Members, every ſtep taken afterwards tended to reſtoring the King; *yet that* very Parliament voted *the taking Arms to defend their* juſt Rights *to be juſt and lawful.* So did that *Bleſſed Parliament*, as King *Charles* II. call'd it; after the King was reſtor'd, in the Caſe of Mr. *Lenthal*, the old Speaker. Thus it appears, that the Term *Rebels* beſtow'd on the Members of the glorious Parliament that ſate from the Year 1641 to 1647, and the Title of *Grand Rebellion* given to the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory, are directly contrary to the Senſe of two Parliaments, who diſtinguiſh'd themſelves by their Zeal for the Reſtoration of King *Charles* II. and their Loyalty to him after he was reſtor'd.

As to the injuſtice and outrage of the Term *Rebels*, let me add the Authority of General *Monk* himſelf, who call'd the ſame Perſons, whom the *Rump* call'd *Rebels*, Delinquents, and the *Royaliſts* Rebels. His Countrymen of *Devonſhire* having written him a Letter to reſtore the *ſecluded Members*, he anſwered it, not many days before he actually reſtor'd them, importing, that it could not be done for ſeveral Reaſons, as *being contrary to Declarations, directly*

oppoſite

oppoſite to the Intereſt of a Commonwealth, and would unſettle the Poſſeſſion of Dean, Chapters, Delinquents, *Crown, and* REBELS LANDS. This Letter to the *Devonſhire* Men was printed and
Ludl. p. 812. publiſhed by his Order. Let us conclude this Article with an Obſervation or two of the firſt *Anneſley* Earl of *Angleſey*, in his excellent Preface to *Whitlocke*'s Memorials.

Livy, ſays his Lordſhip, *every where made honourable Mention of* Scipio, Aſranius, *and even* of Brutus and Caſſius, *often ſtiling them excellent Perſons; yet was he not leſs beloved of* Auguſtus Cæſar, *nor had from him other Reprimand than to be call'd* Pompeianus. *Nor did thoſe times ever call them* Rogues *and* Regicides, *terms that afterwards a more degenerate and* Un-Roman Generation, *under the Miniſtry of* Sejanus, *beſtowed upon them:* Lucian *makes ſport with a certain dealer in Hiſtory, who gave the Captain of his own Party the Name of* Achilles, *and always call'd the Enemies General* Therſites. What follows is a juſt but ſevere Reflection on ſuch Hiſtory, as that of the *Grand Rebellion: There are ſome ſort of Writings devoted to the Paſſions and lower Agitations of the Soul, to ſtir up Anger, and whet up a ruſting Animoſity.* There is nothing elſe meant by the Terms REBELS and REGICIDES. *But of all others it worſt becomes an Hiſtorian to be dipt in any Drudgery of this nature.*

Conſidering what the *noble Vindicator* is about to ſay againſt the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory, as it relates to Sir *Richard Granville*, one could not expect to find ſo many good things ſaid of it in the ſame Treatiſe. *'Tis received univerſally as the Standard of Truth. His Affirmation has been thought ſufficient Authority for whoever has written after him.* It cannot well be ſaid to be univerſally
Vol. 13. p. 26. received, as the Standard of Truth, becauſe Monſ. *de Rapin Thoyras*, one of the moſt knowing and impartial Hiſtorians that ever writ, aſſures us, *It is full of Proofs of Prejudice, and Prepoſſeſſion*; and in another place, he explains the Reaſons of its being ſo full of
ib. p. 344. *Prepoſſeſſion and Prejudice.*

" It was written with a deſign to juſtify the Conduct of King " *Charles* the Firſt, and place it in the beſt light it is capable of. " If there is any blemiſh in that Hiſtory, it is, that the Views of " the Author are too undiſguiſed. This has made *impartial* Readers " think, it was not writ ſo much with intent to inſtruct the Publick " in the Truth of Facts, as to prepoſſeſs the World by divers Arti- " fices and numberleſs Inſinuations in favour of a Syſtem, which all " Readers, who have a ſufficient Knowledge of the Hiſtory and " Government of *England*, will doubtleſs not come into."

So

So far is the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory from being the *Standard of Truth*, as the Noble Vindicator repreſents it in the Place above cited, that all *Impartial Readers*, according to *Rapin*, think it was not written ſo much to inſtruct as to impoſe upon the World, by divers *Artifices*. Nay, by Artifices, that like Moats and Straws ſwim upon the Surface; by Views *too undiſguis'd*, of which I ſhall produce a few Inſtances out of *Rapin* in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe, to ſhew that Perſons of the beſt Judgment and moſt approv'd Integrity, are in the ſame Sentiments with me, as to the Truth and Impartiality of the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory.

The Noble Vindicator allows *the Earl of* Clarendon *is too paſſionate, and too much intereſted*, which certainly cuts off the Claim to ſufficient Authority. *The Reverend Hiſtorian Mr.* Echard *is too implicite and credulous*; but I do not confine it, as he is pleas'd to do, to the Hiſtory of Sir *Richard Granville*. It could not but be with the utmoſt Satisfaction, that I found what I have always thought and ſaid of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, confirm'd by theſe Expreſſions of it in the *Vindication*.

When we find an Author labouring beyond Meaſure to depreſs any particular Man's Character, loſing his Temper, whenever he has occaſion to name him; entering into ungenerous Enquiries into private Circumſtances, and domeſtick Concerns, Diſputes between Man and Wife, and meer Tittle-Tattle, inconſiſtent with the Gravity of Hiſtory, or the Moderation of an Hiſtorian, what can we think, but that ſome ſecret Reſentment was the Cauſe; the very manner of introducing or purſuing the Argument, will be ſufficient to make the Truth *ſuſpected*, of which it is impoſſible, that ſuch a Hiſtory ſhould be the *Standard*; and this is all ſaid of the Earl of *Clarendon's*. Let the Reader judge now to whom his Lordſhip's Memory is moſt oblig'd; to thoſe Gentlemen who labour to lay all this Blame on his Lordſhip himſelf, or to Me who would charge his Editors with it?

We read in the *Vindication*, " The noble Hiſtorian opens his p. 507.
" Ninth Book, with a ſolemn emphatical Preamble, profeſſing the
" ſtricteſt Impartiality, in relation to Perſons and Facts. *The Pre-*
" *face and Dedication to the Hiſtory of the* Grand Rebellion,
" *abound with ſuch Profeſſions.* He declares, there was not one
" Man, who acted any Part in that Service, with whom he had ever
" any perſonal Difference."

Contrary to which, the Noble Vindicator adds, but that *there is* One *Exception at leaſt to this general Declaration, is what I ſhall*

 under-

undertake to prove; and it is ſo well prov'd, that the Charge of Miſrepreſentation and Partiality will ſtand good againſt it as long as it lives, was it to be as Immortal as the Names of *Thucydides* and *Livy*.

After ſo much Panegyrick has been waſted upon it, how muſt one be ſurpris'd to read in the Vindication, *Every Corner of private as well as publick Life muſt be ranſack'd for a Character*; and yet it is the Characters that are the *inimitable*, the *marvellous*, and almoſt *divine* Parts of the Work; of which it is there ſaid farther, *How could the noble Hiſtorian forſake his Dignity and Gravity, and condeſcend to ſuch humble Remarks?* pray Mind. *Can there be any thing more cruel and ungenerous, than to expoſe to publick View, the little domeſtick Jarrings, which but too often happen in Families, and to convey to futurity the Memory of private Misfortunes, which a good-natur'd Man would rather chooſe to cover with Silence, than proclaim! Could there be a ſtronger Indication of ſome private Reſentment, and perſonal Grudge?*

We may, after reading this, venture to read the *Dedication and Preface*, which are one continu'd Declamation on the Truth, Candour, and Sincerity of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, and on that Account were recommended by the late Biſhop *Atterbury*, who ſaid, we are indebted for them in part to the late Earl of *R*———. The noble *Vindicator* adds, *Having prepar'd, as he thinks, and ſufficiently prejudiced the Reader.* We cannot help obſerving here the Agreement between the noble *Vindicator* and Monſ. *Rapin* in Judgment upon the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, as to the *Prepoſſeſſion* and *Prejudice*, which are thus exaggerated in the *Vindication*; "There is an artful way of telling a Story, which ſhall make "the moſt innocent Action appear criminal: For example, if I "ſhould ſay, ſuch a one had kill'd ſuch a Man, ſaying no more, it "paſſes for Murder; but if I add, in his own Defence, it becomes "a different Story. It is thus *the noble Hiſtorian and his* Echo, "Mr. Archdeacon, deal with Sir *Richard Granville*, charging him "with Facts, which by concealing the Motives, cannot but affect "the Reader with Prejudice."

Mr. *Echard* is very juſtly term'd here, *the* Echo *of the Lord* Clarendon; and for want of ſufficient Judgment to diſtinguiſh the *Good* from the *Bad*, he has *echo'd* whatever was told him, right or wrong, decent or indecent, like that falſe Nymph of the Foreſt.

But to preſerve the Character of *Impartial* my ſelf, at the ſame time that I am charging others with *Partiality*, I muſt take off that Impu-

Imputation in the firſt inſtance of it, out of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion* relating to Sir *Richard Granville*. The Earl of *Clarendon* writes,

" A Meſſage paſt between Sir *Richard* and the Lord *Roberts*, " the two oppoſite Generals for the King and the Parliament, which " kindled ſuch furious Reſentments between them, that all, who " fell afterwards into their Hands on both ſides, were put to death " by the Sword, or which was worſe, by the Halter." The noble Vindicator Remarks, *if the Chancellor had been ſo good as to explain the Nature, and the Occaſion of that Meſſage, with all its Circumſtances, Sir* Richard *would have been fully acquitted of the Conſequences. The Fact was as follows.*

" Sir *Richard* commanded at that time the Blockade of *Ply-* " *mouth*, the Lord *Roberts* was Governor, a Man, ſays the Hiſto- " rian, of a ſour, ſurly Nature, *&c.* It happened in ſome Skirmiſh, " where Priſoners were taken on both ſides, a young Gentleman of " about ſixteen Years of Age, near Kinſman to Sir *Richard*, and of " his own Name, fell into the Enemies Hands. Sir *Richard*, by a " civil Meſſage reclaim'd him, as his Kinſman, offering any Terms " by Ranſom or Exchange. The Governor order'd him in the In- " ſtant, to be hang'd up at the Gates of the Town, in ſight of the " Meſſenger, without other Reply. After an Execution ſo Cruel " and Inhumane, and of ſo exaſperating a Nature, what could follow " but the utmoſt returns of Revenge?"

The Fact is differently repreſented in *Whitlocke*'s Memorials. *One* p. 106. Greenville, *a Kinſman of Sir* Richard Greenville, *was perſuaded into a Plot to betray* Plymouth; *but the Plot was diſcover'd, and Mr.* Greenville *executed.*

This Relation of it raiſes many difficulties in that of the *Vindication.* It is not likely that the Plotter was but ſixteen Years of Age, nor that he fell into the Lord *Roberts*'s Hands, by being taken in a Skirmiſh, at the ſame time that Sir *Richard Granville* took ſeveral of the Lord *Roberts*'s Men. The likelihood is, that he was of an Age for Intrigue, that he came voluntarily to *Plymouth*, and pretended to be a Friend, in order to carry on his deſign againſt the Garriſon the better; or if he was a Priſoner there, that he broke in upon the ſtricteſt Rule of a Priſoner in a garriſon'd Town, by endeavouring to betray it. He was executed therefore for Treaſon, and as the worſt ſort of Spy, for whom there could not by the Law of Arms be any Ranſom or Exchange, conſequently Sir *Richard* had no right to reclaim him, which makes his Revenges ſo many Murders,

undertake to prove; and it is ſo well prov'd, that the Charge of Miſrepreſentation and Partiality will ſtand good againſt it as long as it lives, was it to be as Immortal as the Names of *Thucydides* and *Livy*.

After ſo much Panegyrick has been waſted upon it, how muſt one be ſurpris'd to read in the Vindication, *Every Corner of private as well as publick Life muſt be ranſack'd for a Character*; and yet it is the Characters that are the *inimitable*, the *marvellous*, and almoſt *divine* Parts of the Work; of which it is there ſaid farther, *How could the noble Hiſtorian forſake his Dignity and Gravity, and condeſcend to ſuch humble Remarks?* pray Mind. *Can there be any thing more cruel and ungenerous, than to expoſe to publick View, the little domeſtick Jarrings, which but too often happen in Families, and to convey to futurity the Memory of private Misfortunes, which a good-natur'd Man would rather chooſe to cover with Silence, than proclaim! Could there be a ſtronger Indication of ſome private Reſentment, and perſonal Grudge?*

We may, after reading this, venture to read the *Dedication and Preface*, which are one continu'd Declamation on the Truth, Candour, and Sincerity of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, and on that Account were recommended by the late Biſhop *Atterbury*, who ſaid, we are indebted for them in part to the late Earl of *R*———. The noble *Vindicator* adds, *Having prepar'd, as he thinks, and ſufficiently prejudiced the Reader.* We cannot help obſerving here the Agreement between the noble *Vindicator* and Monſ. *Rapin* in Judgment upon the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion*, as to the *Prepoſſeſſion* and *Prejudice*, which are thus exaggerated in the *Vindication*; "There is an artful way of telling a Story, which ſhall make "the moſt innocent Action appear criminal: For example, if I "ſhould ſay, ſuch a one had kill'd ſuch a Man, ſaying no more, it "paſſes for Murder; but if I add, in his own Defence, it becomes "a different Story. It is thus *the noble Hiſtorian and his* Echo, "Mr. Archdeacon, deal with Sir *Richard Granville*, charging him "with Facts, which by concealing the Motives, cannot but affect "the Reader with Prejudice."

Mr. *Echard* is very juſtly term'd here, *the* Echo *of the Lord* Clarendon; and for want of ſufficient Judgment to diſtinguiſh the *Good* from the *Bad*, he has *echo'd* whatever was told him, right or wrong, decent or indecent, like that falſe Nymph of the Foreſt.

But to preſerve the Character of *Impartial* my ſelf, at the ſame time that I am charging others with *Partiality*, I muſt take off that Impu-

Imputation in the firſt inſtance of it, out of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion* relating to Sir *Richard Granville*. The Earl of *Clarendon* writes,

" A Meſſage paſt between Sir *Richard* and the Lord *Roberts*, " the two oppoſite Generals for the King and the Parliament, which " kindled ſuch furious Reſentments between them, that all, who " fell afterwards into their Hands on both ſides, were put to death " by the Sword, or which was worſe, by the Halter." The noble Vindicator Remarks, *if the Chancellor had been ſo good as to explain the Nature, and the Occaſion of that Meſſage, with all its Circumſtances, Sir* Richard *would have been fully acquitted of the Conſequences. The Fact was as follows.*

" Sir *Richard* commanded at that time the Blockade of *Ply-* " *mouth*, the Lord *Roberts* was Governor, a Man, ſays the Hiſto- " rian, of a ſour, ſurly Nature, *&c.* It happened in ſome Skirmiſh, " where Priſoners were taken on both ſides, a young Gentleman of " about ſixteen Years of Age, near Kinſman to Sir *Richard*, and of " his own Name, fell into the Enemies Hands. Sir *Richard*, by a " civil Meſſage reclaim'd him, as his Kinſman, offering any Terms " by Ranſom or Exchange. The Governor order'd him in the In- " ſtant, to be hang'd up at the Gates of the Town, in ſight of the " Meſſenger, without other Reply. After an Execution ſo Cruel " and Inhumane, and of ſo exaſperating a Nature, what could follow " but the utmoſt returns of Revenge?"

The Fact is differently repreſented in *Whitlocke*'s Memorials. *One* Greenville, *a Kinſman of Sir* Richard Greenville, *was perſuaded into a Plot to betray* Plymouth; *but the Plot was diſcover'd, and Mr.* Greenville *executed.* p. 106.

This Relation of it raiſes many difficulties in that of the *Vindication*. It is not likely that the Plotter was but ſixteen Years of Age, nor that he fell into the Lord *Roberts*'s Hands, by being taken in a Skirmiſh, at the ſame time that Sir *Richard Granville* took ſeveral of the Lord *Roberts*'s Men. The likelihood is, that he was of an Age for Intrigue, that he came voluntarily to *Plymouth*, and pretended to be a Friend, in order to carry on his deſign againſt the Garriſon the better; or if he was a Priſoner there, that he broke in upon the ſtricteſt Rule of a Priſoner in a garriſon'd Town, by endeavouring to betray it. He was executed therefore for Treaſon, and as the worſt ſort of Spy, for whom there could not by the Law of Arms be any Ranſom or Exchange, conſequently Sir *Richard* had no right to reclaim him, which makes his Revenges ſo many Murders,

and not Acts of Hoſtility, if *Whitlocke*, whom Mr. *Echard* calls a very *fair Writer*, ſpeaks Truth. And I muſt beg leave to obſerve here, that Family-Memoirs are by no Means ſo Authentick on the ſide of a Family, as are publick *Memorials*, whoſe Authors have no particular Intereſt to biaſs them, and if any Intereſt at all, 'tis that of the Publick, or at leaſt of a Party: The latter of which, is indeed the wrongeſt of all Biaſſes, as we find by woful Experience, in the Earl of *Clarendon*'s and Mr. *Echard*'s Hiſtories.

To conceal or ſink any Hiſtorical Paſſage, is allow'd by all to be as unfair, as falſifying; and the Noble *Vindicator* charges the Noble Hiſtorian with this, in a Paſſage relating to Sir *Richard Granville*'s private Life only; *He not only conceals all the ſeveral Gradations of Hardſhips, but affirms*, point blank, contrary to Fact, *that the Decree in Chancery was* AGAINST *Sir* Richard, *inſtead of being* FOR HIM, *and to ſoften the Sentence, makes the Fine leſs than it was by Two Thouſand Pounds.*

Pray, Gentlemen, I addreſs my ſelf to the Learned, who are labouring, as the late Biſhop *Atterbury* did, to ſecure all the Merit and Glory of the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion* to the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Memory, entirely without any one Partner; pray be pleas'd to obſerve here, that the Noble *Vindicator* in this *one* Paragraph, brings theſe *three* Charges againſt the noble Hiſtorian.

Firſt, His concealing the Gradations of the Hardſhip.

Secondly, His affirming the Decree to be *Con*, when it was *Pro*.

Thirdly, His concealing Two Thouſand Pounds of the Fine.

Will it not be as well worth your while to diſcharge your Hiſtorian of theſe terrible Allegations, as to inſiſt upon the Genuineneſs of your Hiſtory; and that whatever Faults are in it, the Earl himſelf only is anſwerable for them? But there's a very great Diſcouragement lies in your way, for after you have ſet aſide theſe three Charges by proving *Negatives* againſt *Affirmatives*, you will probably be preſented with ſome hundreds more of the like Nature. Conſider a little ſeriouſly what is ſaid by the Noble *Vindicator*. The Earl of *Clarendon* affirms, *point blank, contrary to Fact*; and then be ſo good as to take into Conſideration, what the ſame honourable Author ſaid of the Biſhop of *Salisbury*'s Hiſtory, *A Man convicted upon Record of wilfully bearing falſe Teſtimony in any one ſingle Caſe, will hardly have his Evidence admitted in another.* Here are three Inſtances in a Line or two, the *one point blank falſe*, the other *two* not much better: and will you plead *guilty* to this Charge, or confeſs it by not pleading at all, as you have hitherto done?

done? According to the *Vindication*, you muſt bring your Hiſtorian off of this *Point blank Falſhood*, or his Teſtimony is not to be taken in any other Caſe whatſoever. Thus what will become of his ſuperexcellent Characters, what of the *Heroiſm of the Cavaliers*, and the Saintſhip of *Laud*, *&c.* Sure all this deſerves ſome Conſideration, and what you have ſhould not be all ſquanderd away in proving, that every body have waſh'd their Hands of this Hiſtory, but your great Oracle and Benefactor. If all the Informations concerning the Male-practice in the editing of it, are falſe, and all the Suſpicion groundleſs, you might long ago have prevented the Clamour, by producing the Original; but how will you prevent its being univerſally cenſur'd for *Prejudice* and *Prepoſſeſſion*, *Miſrepreſentation* and *Partiality*, Blemiſhes that blacken it a thouſand times more than a Suſpicion, or even Proof of Impoſture; for if a thing is Falſe, it is no matter who ſaid it, and to clear it in this Point, is the only way to recover its Reputation.

I have taken all due Care to avoid giving Offence, in Sentiment or Expreſſion, farther than the Subject may it ſelf offend; yet as cautious as I have, and ought to have been, I muſt confeſs, I have not been without Provocation, ſometimes to ſpeak the whole of the Truth, and in very intelligible Terms, ſuch is the following Paſſage: *He put the old Soldier on a* PACK of KNAVES. I will give a Liſt of twenty of thoſe *Knaves*, and leave it to the Reader to compare the Stile and the Characters.

Denzil Holles Eſq; afterwards Lord *Holles*.
John Crew Eſq; afterwards Lord *Crew*.
Arthur Anneſley Eſq; afterwards Earl of *Angleſey*.
Sir *Anthony Aſhley Cooper*, afterwards Earl of *Shaftesbury*.

John Selden Eſq;	Sir *Benjamin Rudyard*.
John Pym Eſq;	*Alexander Popham* Eſq;
William Pierepoint Eſq;	*John Hampden* Eſq;
Sir *John Holland*.	Lord *Wenman*.
Sir *Harbottle Grimſton*.	Sir *William Armyne*.
Sir *John Evelyn*.	Sir *Philip Stapleton*.
Sir *Richard Onſlow*.	Sir *William Lewis*.
Lord *Fairfax*.	Sir *Thomas Middleton*.

It is no Flattery to ſay there were not greater Men in the *Roman* Senate, when *Rome* was at the height of her Liberty and Glory; but they were *Presbyterians*, and might therefore be plunder'd, not only with Impunity, but Applauſe. The Fact is this, Sir *Richard Granville*

Granville had receiv'd a conſiderable Sum of Money of the Parliament to raiſe Forces for them, and as ſoon as they were rais'd, deſerted with them to the King. One cannot think, that the calling that Money *Arrears*, will excuſe a breach of Truſt and Deſertion. Suppoſing the Money was Arrears, if after he had deſerted their Service in *Ireland*, and forfeited theſe Arrears by ſuch Deſertion, the Parliament forgiving it, and paying him the Money, on Condition he rais'd Forces with it for their Service; the Treachery and Breach of Truſt are the ſame, as if there had been no Arrear coming to him. Beſides, it is very much queſtion'd, whether Sir *Richard Granville* was in ſuch Circumſtances as to ſerve without Pay, ſo long that there was an Arrear ſufficient to levy a Regiment of Horſe due to him. The Parliament ſo highly reſented this treacherous Act, that the Knight was not only hang'd in Effigy, but was excepted out of their general Pardons.

We come now to a Paragraph wherein the *Grand Rebellion* and Mr. *Echard*'s Hiſtory are again ſet in the light I always ſaw them.

" Upon theſe and ſuch like Inſtances, Mr. Archdeacon boldly " takes it upon himſelf, as of his own certain Knowledge, upon the " ſingle Teſtimony of a prejudic'd Author, to pronounce dogmati- " cally *in Verbo Sacerdotis*, without any Ceremony or Modification, " a gallant Man, conſummate in Military Knowledge, untainted " in his Loyalty, illuſtrious by his Birth and numerous Alliances, " to have been the greateſt *Tyrant*, the greateſt *Oppreſſor*, the " greateſt *Plunderer* that ever was felt wherever his Authority ex- " tended." He has the *Chancellor*'s Word for it; and the noble *Vindicator* proves that it is not True.——This is the Light I always ſaw their Hiſtories in.

We drop the Hiſtory of the Councils and Actions of the *Royaliſts* in the *Weſt*, becauſe there does not ſeem to us to be that Importance in every Motion, and every Word, which their Writers impoſe upon us. We cannot therefore take the ſame delight in the Story, being ſatisfy'd, had their Counſels been as united as the Pope's or *French* King's; they would have ſubmitted, as they did, at the approach of the Parliament's Army, or have been beaten into the Sea. How unnatural it looks to hear People talk of Principles of Honour, when they are in Arms againſt the Intereſt and Liberty of their Country; and indeed of *untainted Loyalty*, when they are doing what they can to deſtroy the Conſtitution in Oppoſition to theſe Principles of Honour? We are told *Cromwell* ſet up a Spirit of *Enthuſiaſm*; for *Religion* is as eaſily turn'd into *Enthuſiaſm*, as Reſiſtance is into *Rebellion*. The

The next Paragraph muſt perplex every one that knows the Tranſactions in the *Civil Wars*.

" This Infection was not yet ſpread in the *Weſt*, where alone " every thing continu'd quiet and hopeful, when the Prince, too " young, and unexperienc'd to judge for himſelf, was ſent down " attended with one of theſe Councils, of which the Chancellor was " Preſident and Supreme Director; Sir *Richard Granville* was then " at the Head of the Troops."

There are ſeveral ſuch Flouriſhes in the Earl of *Clarendon*'s and Archdeacon *Echard*'s Hiſtories. The true State of Affairs at that Period of the War was this.

Sir *Thomas Fairfax*, General of the Parliament Army, after his Victory of *Naſeby*, which was deciſive, and ruin'd the *Royaliſts* beyond Recovery, march'd *Weſtward*, and took in all the ſtrong Towns and Caſtles in his March; while he was doing this, the *Royaliſts* were quiet in *Cornwall*, 'tis true, but far from being in a hopeful Condition. See *Whitlocke*, p. 186. *Letters* from Sir Thomas Fairfax *certify'd, that* Greenville *began to be contemptible in* Cornwall, *as* Goring *was in* Devonſhire, *that* 600 *of the* Corniſh *Men mutiny'd, and half of them went home*, &c.

The noble *Vindicator*, in the enſuing Paſſage, very juſtly objects againſt the noble Hiſtorian's way of arguing, which no Man had before objected againſt, without being ſuſpected to be Heterodox and unſound in his *Creed*.

This Command, ſays the Chancellor, *was ſuperiour to what he had before. Strange Logick, that Part ſhould be more than the Whole, the Lieutenant greater than the Captain.* Again, *Oh! but there was a diſcontented Party in* Cornwall, *and he would have put himſelf at the Head of it. Stranger and ſtranger ſtill! A diſcontented Party, where all were known to be profeſt* Royaliſts.

Had it not been leſs exceptionable, if it had been ſaid, where ſo great a number, or where the greateſt number was known to be ſo: for there were many Gentlemen, Freeholders, and others, who did not value themſelves on their hatred to the Parliament, and who groan'd under the Oppreſſion of the *Royaliſts*, while all things were ſo quiet and ſo hopeful, if what *Whitlocke* tells us, is true. p. 196.

The Corniſh *Men preſented a Petition to Sir* Thomas Fairfax, *offering Themſelves, Lives, and Fortunes to ſerve the Parliament, acknowledging the General the Inſtrument of their Deliverance from Bondage. The Country People alſo aſſiſted Sir* Thomas Fairfax *in blocking up the Paſſes to hinder the King's Forces from eſcaping.*

The

The Noble *Vindicator* has all the Reaſon in the World to expect the moſt tender Treatment from the *Univerſality* that adore the Hiſtory of the GRAND REBELLION, but what would they have ſaid of Me, had I dropt any Expreſſions againſt the Author like theſe?

A cruel and u natural Reflection upon many Perſons of Honour, who had devoted their Lives and Fortunes to the King.

The Praiſe of one's Country is very grateful and laudable, eſpecially when it is prais'd for ſome Quality extreamly beneficial to the Inhabitants; but unleſs the Term *Loyalty* was well explain'd, whereby one might underſtand the *Loyal* Perſon to be zealous for the Rights, Properties, and Liberties of his Fellow-Subjects, in the Protection of which he is ready to defend and aſſiſt his Sovereign, at the Expence of his Blood and Treaſure; how can this boaſted Loyalty be taken in a meritorious Senſe, eſpecially as it is apply'd to the *Corniſh*, who, as in the above-cited Petition of their Countrymen, kept their Neighbours in Bondage.

The next Charge of *Partiality*, if not worſe, againſt the Earl of *Clarendon's* Hiſtory, is as follows.

"What then was left for the Chancellor to do, but to ſhift the "blame any where from himſelf? What could be more natural, "not only Sir *Richard Granville*, but every Officer of the Army, "nay, the Soldiery themſelves, the very private Men, all who diſ-"fer'd from him in the Council, or in the Prince's Family, not one "eſcapes the ſtroke of his Pen. In this part of the Hiſtory, there-"fore, he is rather to be ſuppos'd an Advocate for his own Con-"duct, than an impartial Relator of the Actions of others."

There is too much Reaſon to affirm the like may be ſaid of all the other Parts of the Hiſtory, where his Party are magnify'd, and their Opponents abus'd. Indeed it has been ſaid by others, beſides the late Biſhop *Atterbury*, that the Hiſtorian was incapable of ſaying any thing contrary to *Probity* and *Truth*; and it is affirm'd by very learned Perſons, that there is nothing in all the Hiſtory of that kind. But were that as true as it is otherwiſe, it would not prove the Hiſtorian incapable of ſuch a thing. Read what Sir *Richard Granville* wrote the Duke of *York*, in a Letter from *St. Malo* in the Year 1650.

Notwithſtanding, ſays Sir *Richard*, *I have ſo powerful an Enemy as Sir* Edward Hyde, *to miſrepreſent my Actions to the King.* Upon which the Noble Vindicator makes this juſt Remark: *Here you have a direct Charge under Sir* Richard's *own Hand againſt*

the

the Chancellor, as being his powerful Enemy, and a Misrepresenter of his Actions.

In a Defence publish'd by this Knight in *Holland*, Ann. 1654, he said, *He serv'd in* Ireland, *until Letters importun'd him to come for* England *for his Majesty's Service.*

This being directly contrary to what the Earl of *Clarendon* writes, one must suppose that his Lordship knew Sir *Richard Granville's* Affairs better than Sir *Richard* himself, or that what is said in the History of the *Grand Rebellion* is not true; in which Case all the Declamation upon the Truth, Impartiality, Sincerity, and Candour of that History in the *Dedication* and *Prefaces* to it, is groundless and prepposterous, let whoever will be the Author of it: it being plain that the Disagreement between the Earl of *Clarendon's* Account of Sir *Richard Granville* and Sir *Richard's* Account of himself, must be the Effect of personal Prejudice and Resentment.

The Noble *Vindicator* justifies what we say of that Historian; where he says, *The Chancellor affirms, Sir* Richard *left* Ireland *upon a Scruple of Conscience, not to serve after the* Cessation *to ingratiate himself with the Parliament:* which, as we have seen, was to get a round Sum of Money of them to raise Men for their Service, and then run away with them to the King. *If this is not misrepresenting*, what is? adds the Noble *Vindicator*. And we may well insist upon it, that this one so flagrant an Instance of Pique and Resentment in this Character, is enough to spoil the Credit and Merit of all the Rest, as we read of Bishop *Burnet* in the same *Vindication*, tho' perhaps there is not the like Reason for it.

The Honourable Author of the *Vindication* is offended with that Infamous *Cessation* made with the *Irish* Massacrers, for which the Parliament voted to Impeach the Marquis of *Ormond*, as a *Traytor* against the three Kingdoms. The Forces, which were sent from *England* to serve against the *Irish* Cut-throats, were sent back to *England* by that Marquis, to serve against the Parliament, who rais'd and paid them; and this is one of the Exploits for which there is such a Profusion of Panegyrick upon that Lord *Ormond*, in the Earl of *Clarendon's* and Archdeacon *Echard's* Histories. The Noble Vindicator assures us, That fatal Cessation *with the Rebels was as much exclaim'd against by the King's Friends at* Oxford, *as by his Enemies at* Westminster. Yet the Lord *Clarendon* writes of himself in the Article of the *Uxbridge-Treaty*, Mr. *Hyde*

 prov'd

prov'd that Ceſſation *to be juſt and neceſſary, and put the Parliament's Commiſſioners out of Countenance*; which, beſides that it was not ſo in Fact, as is prov'd elſewhere, was it ſeems contrary to the Sentiments of the King's beſt Friends, then with him at *Oxford*; who, if they exclaim'd againſt the *Ceſſation*, as much as the Parliament did, which we are told by the Noble *Vindicator*, were ſo far from thinking it juſt and neceſſary, that they deem'd it to be Traytorous and Infamous. You perceive, Gentlemen, I addreſs to the Learned, who have undertaken the Defence and Protection of the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory, againſt all Objection and Oppoſition, That Buſineſs will thicken upon your Hands, if you are provok'd by ſo many repeated Challenges to an attempt to prove your *Hiſtory* to be True as well as Genuine; which is certainly incumbent on Perſons of a ſacred Function, who are by no means excuſable for crying up a Book written on purpoſe to deceive and impoſe upon Mankind, as *Rapin* ſays, and we have already ſaid after him. To which we think it may not be improper to add ſome Inſtances out of his Hiſtory, proving the *Prepoſſeſſion* and *Prejudice* of the Earl of *Clarendon*'s.

THE

HISTORY of the GRAND REBELLION

Prov'd to be full of *Partiality* and *Miſrepreſentation*,

By M. *de RAPIN THOYRAS*.

Vol. 9. p. 563. THE *French* Hiſtorian ſpeaking of the Reſtitution of the *Palatinate* writes, *The Earl of* Clarendon *took care not to ſpeak like the reſt of the Hiſtorians*. I ſuppoſe, it will not be pretended that the Earl was the only true Hiſtorian, and that all the reſt were falſe; but indeed one does not know what may be pretended to by ſuch Men as we have to deal with. *Rapin* again,

" The Earl of *Clarendon* lays the Blame upon Sir *Henry Vane*, " *for the Diſſolution of the* ſhort Parliament *in* 1640. Yet *Whit-* " *locke* ſays, it was chiefly by *Laud*'s Advice that the Parliament " was diſſolv'd."

Whitlocke is here very juſtly prefer'd to the Lord *Clarendon*, whoſe Hiſtory, as I have prov'd in the *Compariſon*, hardly agrees with *Whitlocke*'s in any one Article, where the Reputation of the *Laudæans* was in queſtion.

" I

" I ſhall content my ſelf, ſays *Rapin*, with obſerving, that the " Earl of *Clarendon* omits no occaſion to combat the Principles of " the Parliament, or to impute to them Motives altogether different " from thoſe they pretended to act by." Vol. 11. p. 14.

Here the Hiſtorian is charg'd with falſe Imputations, which his Defenders will find it ſo difficult to clear him of, that I fear it will diſcourage them from attempting it.

Every body knew before that Hiſtory appear'd, that the Hiſtorian was an inveterate Enemy to Proteſtant Diſſenters. His Reaſons for it do not always ſeem to be founded on the ſtrongeſt Baſis.

" However, ſays *Rapin*, Mr. *Hyde* and others made uſe of this " Argument of the Biſhops being the Repreſentative of the Clergy " in their Speeches againſt the taking away the Biſhops Voices in " the Houſe of Lords, which certainly was no Argument at all; " the Prelates doubtleſs, as well as Mitred Abbots, ſitting in Parlia- " ment on account of their *Baronies*, like the reſt of the Nobility." p. 690.

Monſieur *Rapin* ſpeaks very tenderly of the noble Hiſtorian, out of great deference to his Rank and Merit; yet he gives us to underſtand, he very much ſuſpects a wrong Biaſs in his Hiſtory.

" The Earl of *Clarendon* grants, that a Handful of Men at firſt, " much inferior in Number and Credit, converted in the end the " whole Houſe to their Opinion. But as he was a zealous Stickler " for the King, he took care not to aſcribe the Succeſs of this " Handful to the Weight and Solidity of the Reaſons alledged by " the Others to reduce them to their Sentiments. It was requiſite " however to give ſome Reaſon of it, and he found no better than " the Lazineſs, Negligence and Indifference of the King's Friends, " and the Vigilance of the others. I do not know whether this " Reaſon will be capable to ſatisfy the impartial and unbiaſs'd."

This proves the Hiſtorian to be *Partial* again; for that Reaſon did moſt certainly ſatisfy him.

Rapin acknowledges there is even ſome Weakneſs in the next Paſſage.

Upon the paſſing the *Grand Remonſtrance* in 1641, he writes;

" The Lord *Clarendon* ſays, *It was carried by the Hour of the* " *Night, which drove away a greater Number of old and infirm* " *Oppoſers than would have made thoſe of the* Negative, *ſuperior* " *in Number*. But this way of Reaſoning ſeems to me to be weak. " The ſame thing might alſo be alledged to prove that it would " have paſs'd by more than nine Voices, if ſeveral of thoſe who " were for it had not gone out of the Houſe. For how could In-

" firmity or Wearineſs have a greater Effect upon one Party than " the other."

This muſt needs be extremely ſurprizing to the Learned, who have hitherto look'd upon the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion* as the greateſt Effect of Human Underſtanding, and it muſt ſtartle them to find it charged with ſo mean a Blemiſh as Weakneſs amidſt the Shine of ſo much fine Painting, and ſo many fine Periods.

The Army employ'd againſt the *Scots* drew up a Petition to be preſented to the Parliament; at leaſt their Officers drew up one for them about the time that there was a Plot to bring them up to *London* to awe, if not to diſperſe the two Houſes; to which Petition the King put *C. R.* to countenance the ſigning it, as in his Declaration from *Newmarket*, *March* 9, 1641. See *Rapin*.

" If we compare what the King ſays here of the Contents of the " Petition with that the Lord *Clarendon* has inſerted in his Hiſtory, " we ſhall find the Lord *Clarendon*'s cannot be the ſame as the King " wrote *C. R.* upon." I am ſatisfied the Learned, before mentioned, will rather ſuppoſe the Falſification to be in the King's *Declaration*, than in the Earl's Hiſtory; it being in the one or the other, I leave it to them to determine which; my concern not being very great in the matter. *Rapin* again:

Vol. 12. *p.* 20. " What his Lordſhip ſays of the Fight at *Edgehill*, *The King* " *reviewing his Army*, *found there were not wanting above* 300 " *Men*, is hardly credible, even according to his own Deſcription of " the Battle." It is remarkable here, that the Hiſtory of the *Grand Rebellion* is charg'd with want of *Credibility*, and that even by its own Evidence.

p. 52. " His Lordſhip, ſays *Rapin*, has advanc'd the ſame thing, that " there were abundance of *Papiſts* in the Parliament's Army; but " there is not ſo much as a *ſingle Catholick* nam'd."

Again, after *Rapin*;

" I have taken the Deſcription of the Battle of *Newbury* from the *p.* 105. " Earl of *Clarendon*, which by a great many Omiſſions is rendered " obſcure."

He then particularizes thoſe Omiſſions, and adds, *His Lordſhip endeavours to prove, tho' by weak Arguments, that Victory was on the King's ſide. I believe it would be very eaſy to confute his Reaſons.* So very eaſy, that he does not think it worth his while.

Again;

p. 170 " The Earl of *Stamford*, whether to excuſe his Defeat, or whe- " ther he had cauſe, openly declared, that *Chudleigh* had betray'd " him. The Earl of *Clarendon* pretends it was all a *Scandal*; but

" I

" I imagine few are now concern'd to know the Truth. He refers " to *Ruſhworth*, who affirms, *It appeared to have been a* deſign'd " thing." Again:

" His Lordſhip ſupports to the utmoſt the King's ſuſpicion againſt p. 119.
" the Duke of *Hamilton*, and his Brother the Earl of *Lanerck*; " but we find in the *Memoirs* of the Duke of *Hamilton*, a large " Vindication upon that head."

This is ſaid plainly in preference of Biſhop *Burnet*'s Memoirs of Duke *Hamilton*, to the Earl of *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory; the ſame Biſhop *Burnet* who has been of late ſo unhandſomely treated by Perſons who ow'd him better uſage.

" The Earl of *Clarendon*, ſays *Rapin*, affirms the Women-Mob p. 161.
" were the Wives of ſubſtantial Citizens, which is hardly credible." More want of Credibility, you ſee.

I rally'd this pleaſant piece of Hiſtory ſome years ago in a former Treatiſe, as a paſſage fit for nothing but Raillery. *Ruſhworth* proves it falſe, affirming they were *generally of the meaner ſort*. But the common Soldiers on the *Cavalier* ſide are *Gentlemen*, and their Wives Ladies. This Air runs thro' all their Chronicles.

" His Lordſhip, ſays *Rapin*, ſpeaks of the Sentence paſs'd upon p. 194.
" *David Kniveton* by the Parliament, as of a great Injuſtice, for " two Reaſons; *That he was obliged to obey the King, being his* " *Meſſenger*; and, *That the Parliament had not cauſed their* " *Ordinance about Spies to be notified to the King.* I am afraid " all the World will not be induced by theſe Reaſons to condemn " the Proceedings of both Houſes." *Rapin* again:

" This we are inform'd by *Ludlow*'s Memoirs, who was of this p. 400.
" Number. The Lord *Clarendon* gives another Reaſon, which does " not ſeem to me ſo natural." And it had been a wonder if it had ſo ſeemed: For who can give ſo natural a Reaſon for a thing done, as the Perſon who did it? *Rapin* here prefers *Ludlow*'s Memoirs to the *Clarendon* Hiſtory. He makes uſe of them in ſeveral places of his own, and was not deter'd by his being ſo often call'd *Rebel* and *Regicide* by certain Writers of a Profeſſion.

In the Manifeſto of the Army, *A. D.* 1647, 'tis ſaid,

" If after ſo much Blood and Treaſure ſpent, all that they were " to hope for and reſt in, was only what the King had granted in his " Meſſage of the 12th of *May* laſt, what muſt become of the " Kingdom? Read *Rapin.*

This deſtroys the Reaſon of the Members abſenting themſelves, alledged by the Lord Clarendon.

That

That Hiſtorian is full of Conjectures, and ſuch ſort of Reaſons, which other Hiſtories and publick Memoirs intirely deſtroy. This will appear more fully in what follows. *Rapin*, ſpeaking of King *Charles* the Firſt's Treaty with the *Scots*, while he was carrying on an oppoſite Treaty with the Parliament of *England*, writes,

" The Lord *Clarendon* bitterly exclaims againſt the Injuſtice of " this Treaty in the following words: *No Man who reads this* " *Treaty, which very few Men have done, can wonder that ſuch an* " *Engagement met with the Fate that attended it, which con-* " *tained ſo many* monſtrous Conceſſions, *that except the whole* " *Kingdom of* England *had been impriſon'd in* Carisbrook-Caſtle " *with the King, it could not be imagined that it was poſſible* " *to be performed.* I own, how great ſoever my Eſteem may be " for this illuſtrious Hiſtorian, this bare Aſſertion of his, without " any Explanation, is not ſatisfactory to me. After having ex- " amin'd every Clauſe of this Treaty, I meet with none that to " me ſeems *monſtrous.* It is true indeed, that the Article of ſettling " the *Presbyterian* Government in *England* for three years, might " appear to be ſo to the Earl of *Clarendon*, and thoſe who are of " his Opinion. The Reader is to judge whether this *Monſtroſity*, " if I may venture to uſe that Term, is to be aſcrib'd to the thing " itſelf, or to the Hiſtorian's *Prepoſſeſſion* and *Prejudice*; "So great, that *Rapin* inſinuates they were *monſtrous.*

Here it may not be amiſs to pauſe a little, and conſider, what Infatuation People muſt lie under, who believe the Lord *Clarendon's* Hiſtory to be as fair, as candid, and upright as the Dedication to the late Queen repreſents it, or indeed that he was a proper Perſon to write of thoſe Times, when the Party he mortally hated, were prevalent; and the oppoſite Party, in which he himſelf was deeply ingaged, was in diſgrace and miſery. Was it likely a Man of ſuch ſtrong Paſſions ſhould do juſtice to either, and not applaud the one, and calumniate the other, as thoſe Paſſions directed him? Monſieur *de Rapin Thoyras* made this Obſervation before me, tho' I had not then met with it in his Hiſtory.

Another Charge which lies againſt this Author, is the Contempt and Animoſity which he every where diſcovers againſt the Presbyterians *and the* Scots, *even in places where it ſeems intirely foreign to his purpoſe.*

If in common Life a Man goes out of his way to quarrel with a Perſon, is not his Wiſdom or his Temper, or both, call'd in queſtion for it? The Hiſtorian is here charged with abuſing the *Scots* and

the *Presbyterians* out of meer perverſeneſs of Will, without any provocation or inducement to it from his Subject.

Monſieur *de Rapin* adds;

This came from his Heart, and his immoderate Paſſion againſt Presbyterianiſm, *was this great Man's Foible.*

The *Dedicator* does not allow that there is one Foible in the whole Hiſtory. Probably it will be objected he was too nearly related to the Author, to be a proper Judge, tho' ſuch Objection, or indeed any Objection at all is not expected to come from the Quarter, where the defence of it is ſo ſtrennouſly laboured.

Again, after *Rapin:*

He gloried in his hatred of Presbyterians, *and perhaps he contributed more than any other Perſon to that exceſs of Animoſity which ſubſiſts againſt them to this day with the Followers of his Maxims and Principles.*

It is no matter what the Labourers in the Quarter juſt mentioned, ſay or think of this Hatred and Animoſity. All ſober, judicious Perſons of all the Religions in the World will grant, that he who bears Animoſity and Hatred againſt any Men or party of Men, is by no means proper to write their Hiſtory. He muſt be weak in bearing that Hatred and Animoſity for indifferent Matters; and it is not likely that ſuch Weakneſs ſhould reſiſt the Temptations that will eternally lie in his way to reproach and vilify them, as the Hiſtorian has done plentifully where he ſpeaks of the *Presbyterians.* And where could he avoid ſpeaking of them in writing of Times when nine Tranſactions in ten were concerning *Presbytery* and *Presbyterians*, in ſome degree or other.

I ſhall now make no farther uſe of *Rapin*, than to repeat what he ſays of the Earl of *Clarendon's* miſrepreſenting the paſſing of the Vote to agree to the King's *Conceſſions* at the Treaty in the Ille of *Wight.*

It was carried, ſays the Earl, *ſo clearly, that the Houſe was not divided. Rapin* is of another mind. He expreſſes it thus: *I cannot help doubting that was as unanimouſly as the Earl affirms. What we have lately ſeen, ſeems to ſhew rather, that there were many Members who were not content with this Vote.*

I could eaſily fill many Sheets with ſuch Remarks on the *Truth, Impartiality*, and *Candour* of the Hiſtory of the GRAND REBELLION, and confirm them by *Rapin*, and as good Authority as his. But the Subject is worn, and the Character of that Hiſtory ſo worn with it, that it ceaſes to be in repute with the Candid and

Im-

Impartial, who only having Truth in view, like what they are in queſt of, always prevail.

The ſtir that is made to defend it againſt the Charge of Impoſture muſt needs be affected, becauſe it might eaſily have been prevented or ſuppreſs'd by producing the Original, and probably it would have been produced, notwithſtanding the grand Airs of the Delicacy of a Family in that Point, if there was no more in that Charge than they ſeem to make it, or if the Concerned thought the doing ſo would keep up its Credit. For, ſurely, they have reaſon to be apprehenſive that the proving it to be *genuine* would not prove it to be *true*; and their doing it would ſcarce do their buſineſs by halves. They muſt clear it of all the Faults and Foibles which Monſieur *de Rapin* and others load it with, or it will ſink with its own weight.

The Information I received of Male-practice in *editing* it, was ſufficient to warrant my ſuſpicion; that Information was not hunted after, nor expected by me. 'Twas voluntary and ſolemn, and ſo circumſtantiated, that it will ſtick as long as the Original is concealed, or ſhewn *imperfect*, or to no body but thoſe who are in the Secret.

The Importunity that was made me to publiſh a *Reply* to the late Biſhop *Atterbury*'s Vindication, and the Indiſpoſition I was in when that *Reply* was written, occaſion'd the omitting ſeveral things thro' haſte and uneaſineſs, which might have been inſerted from better Opportunities and in better Health. But really that work is not ſo much mine, as it is other Men's. I did not make the Information. The Perſons are all living from whom I had it, and all living too in the beſt Reputation; yet they cannot be named by me without breach of Command, Requeſt, and Promiſe, which is all I ſhall ever ſay more on this Affair, unleſs I am diſcharged from thoſe Obligations.

But let me add once more, and for All, that it is not the Impoſture which ought to be ſo much inſiſted upon, as the *Prejudice* and *Prepoſſeſſion*. Let who will be the Author, the Book is prov'd to be full of thoſe Blemiſhes by *Rapin*, to contain falſe Facts, and malicious Reflections and Suggeſtions, by the *Noble Vindicator*, and to be corrupted with Flattery and falſe Praiſe, to be too *Apologetical* by even the *Craftſman*, whom having named, there is no other Name nor Thing can come after it without doing it an injury.

FINIS.